

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 27, 30 and 31 are amended, and claims 32-35 have been added. Claims 1 – 11 and 27 - 35 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

Objection to the drawings:

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) on the alleged grounds that the code limitations/constraints as further defined in claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22, 30 and 31 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. For the following reasons, this objection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains the objection since the claims define two difference "sync" signals, which are not shown in the amended drawing. However, consistent with the specification, the different sync signals are shown in an example in which a first sync pattern 13 includes a sync bodies 113 that do not satisfy the RLL (d, k) code and a sync identifications (IDs) 115 that satisfy the RLL (d, k) code. Second sync patterns 23 include sync bodies 213 that do not satisfy the RLL (d, k) code and a sync IDs 215 that satisfy the RLL (d, k) code. As shown in FIG. 3 as presented in the Amendment filed April 3, 2007, these sync bodies, sync identifications, and sync patterns are given different numbers to emphasize their being different sync patterns. It is therefore requested that the Examiner reconsider the drawing objection in light of the proposed drawing, entry of which is again requested with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination.

Objection to claims 2 – 11, 23 – 28, 30 and 31 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c)

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2 – 11, 23 – 28, 30 and 31 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as allegedly being in improper dependent form for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. For the reasons previously presented in the Amendment filed April 3, 2007 and which is entered with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, these objections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rejection of claims 1 – 11 and 23 – 26 under 35 U.S.C. §101:

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §101 on the alleged grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory

subject matter, referring to M.P.E.P section 2106. The Examiner alleged that the "wherein" clause of claims 1 and 23 is interpreted as non-descriptive functional subject matter. For the reasons previously presented in the Amendment filed April 3, 2007 and which is entered with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rejection of claim 27 – 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Also at page 4 of the Office Action, claims 27 - 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Roth et al. (U.S. Patent 6,188,335). For the reasons previously presented in the Amendment filed April 3, 2007 and which is entered with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested in light of the claims as presented herein.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: May 21, 2007

By: 

James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510